

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request consideration of the subject application as amended herein. This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed January 8, 2008. Claims 1-32 stand rejected. In this Amendment, claims 1, 3-4, 7-8, 20-22, and 31-32 have been amended. No claims have been canceled. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-4, 7-8, 20-22, and 31-32 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1, 3-4, 7-8, 20-22 and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims have been amended to overcome the Examiner's objections. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner remove the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph and 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 6-15, 20-21, 24-26 and 31-32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradshaw, (U.S. Patent No. 5,835,722, hereinafter "Bradshaw") filed June 27, 1996, in view of Shannon, (U.S. Patent No. 6,233,618, hereinafter "Shannon") filed March 31, 1998.

The Examiner cites Bradshaw, column 6, lines 5-20 and 40-49 for teaching "searching, locally, free-form text contained in a plurality of documents for pre-selected data, the plurality of documents being stored on a plurality of data storage media of the client device." Applicants respectfully disagree.

Bradshaw discloses monitoring data being passed into and out of the topmost application. Bradshaw does not teach or suggest searching text contained in documents. Rather, Bradshaw monitors a user's input by “monitoring computer operations for creation or transmission of vulgar or pornographic material” (Bradshaw, Abstract, emphasis added). For example, Bradshaw monitors data created by the keyboard, data passing through the clipboard, data selected by the mouse pointer, and data passing through the Internet interface for the vulgar and pornographic content (Bradshaw, Abstract). However, the monitoring of computer operations is not equivalent to “searching, locally, text contained in a plurality of documents for pre-selected data, the plurality of documents being stored on a plurality of data storage media of the client device,” as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added).

The language cited by the Examiner in Bradshaw, column 6, lines 5-20, discusses libraries that identify the prohibited data for which the Bradshaw monitoring system is screening for. Moreover, in Bradshaw, these libraries are not searched or monitored. In Bradshaw, the monitoring system monitors data being passed into and out of the topmost application and compares the data in the monitored topmost application to that stored in libraries (Bradshaw, column 5, line 67 to column 6, line 4). Thus, in Bradshaw, the libraries are not searched, but rather store information for which the search is to be performed (Bradshaw, column 6, lines 10-14).

The language cited by the Examiner in Bradshaw, column 6, lines 40-49 discusses how Bradshaw's X-Stop monitoring system handles search engines. In Bradshaw, X-Stop compares a site address or words used in a search request to a library containing a list of search engines sites or words (Bradshaw, column 6, lines 41-47). As noted above, monitoring the site address typed into a keyboard or selected by a mouse or monitoring words typed into a keyboard into a search engine is not equivalent to searching, locally, text contained in a plurality of documents for pre-

selected data, the plurality of documents being stored on a plurality of data storage media of the client device.

The Examiner further cites Bradshaw, column 7, lines 19-38 for similarly teaching “searching, locally, free-form text contained in a plurality of documents for pre-selected data, the plurality of documents being stored on a plurality of data storage media of the client device.” However, Bradshaw, column 7, lines 19-38 describes modifying the libraries. Making a selection from a main menu bar allows for modification of libraries 1-3 (Bradshaw, column 7, lines 19-24). Adding or deleting the lists of prohibited data in the libraries (Bradshaw, column 7, lines 24-28) is not equivalent to searching text contained in documents stored on data storage media of a client device.

Therefore, Bradshaw does not teach or suggest “searching, locally, text contained in a plurality of documents for pre-selected data, the plurality of documents being stored on a plurality of data storage media of the client device,” as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner cites Bradshaw, column 8, lines 35-58 and column 10, lines 15-30 for teaching “detecting at least a portion of the pre-selected data in the free-form text of at least one of the plurality of documents stored on any of the plurality of data storage media of the client device.” Applicants respectfully disagree.

Bradshaw, column 8, lines 35-58 does not describe detecting pre-selected data in the text of documents stored on data storage media of a client device. Rather, the cited language describes the function of the keyboard queue for the keyboard monitoring system. Bradshaw, Figure 3 is a flowchart of “the keystroke monitor [as it] reads keystrokes from the topmost active application” (Bradshaw, column 8, lines 26-27) and records a user’s keystrokes in a keyboard queue. When an application is opened, X-Stop creates an application keyboard queue in computer memory (Bradshaw, column 8, lines 29-30, emphasis added). The keyboard queue is

used to “isolate individual words as they are typed for comparison with X-stop libraries” (Bradshaw, column 8, lines 35-37, emphasis added). Thus, in Bradshaw, a keyboard queue is an application and not equivalent to documents stored on data storage media of a client device. Therefore, Bradshaw is not detecting pre-selected data in the text of documents stored on data storage media of a client device because Bradshaw is comparing the contents of an application, that is, the keyboard queue to the lists in the libraries.

Similarly, the cited language in Bradshaw, column 10, lines 15-30 does not describe detecting pre-selected data in the text of documents stored on data storage media of a client device. Rather, the cited language describes the clipboard sentinel of Bradshaw’s X-Stop monitoring system. Like Bradshaw’s keyboard queue, Bradshaw’s matching of the text in the clipboard to the libraries (Bradshaw, column 10, line 29) is not equivalent to detecting pre-selected data in the text of documents stored on data storage media of a client device because *the clipboard is not a document stored on data storage media of a client device*. Rather, Bradshaw teaches that “the clipboard is an *application that remains active in the background* and is *used for transferring blocks of text*, etc., within an application or from one application to another” (Bradshaw, column 10, lines 16-19, emphasis added). Thus, Bradshaw does not teach or suggest “detecting at least a portion of the pre-selected data in the text of at least one of the plurality of documents stored on any of the plurality of data storage media of the client device,” as taught in claim 1.

Furthermore, Bradshaw does not teach or suggest the searching being performed locally and sending a notification of detection of the pre-selected data from the client device to a server coupled to the client device via a network. The Examiner acknowledges that “Bradshaw is silent with respect to the searching being performed locally and sending a notification of detection of the pre-selected data from the client device to a server coupled to the client device via a network”

(Office Action, pages 4-5) and cites Shannon for such teaching. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Shannon does not teach or suggest the searching being performed locally. The Examiner cites Shannon, column 6, lines 28-35 for such teaching. However, in the cited language, Shannon describes how access control data is needed to define “which clients can access which web pages or data from remote servers at what times and under what conditions” (Shannon, column 6, lines 28-35). Shannon’s description of how access control is needed is not equivalent to searching being performed locally.

Furthermore, Shannon does not teach or suggest “sending a notification of detection of the pre-selected data from the client device to a server coupled to the client device via a network.” The Examiner cites Shannon, column 14, lines 42-48 for such a teaching. However, here, Shannon discloses sending a return notification of denial to the user at the client computer requesting the restricted data. Sending a notification to the client is not equivalent to sending a notification from the client to a server.

Accordingly, the cited references, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the limitations of the present invention that are included in the following language of claim 1:

searching, locally, text contained in a plurality of documents for pre-selected data, the plurality of documents being stored on a plurality of data storage media of the client device, the client device being a personal computing device;

detecting locally at least a portion of the pre-selected data in the text of at least one of the plurality of documents stored on any of the plurality of data storage media of the client device; and

sending a notification of detection of the pre-selected data from the client device to a server coupled to the client device via a network.

Similar language is also included in independent claims 20, 31, and 32. Accordingly, the present invention as claimed in independent claims 1, 20, 31 and 32 is patentable over the cited references.

Claims 4, 16-19, 22 and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being

unpatentable over Bradshaw, in view of Shannon, and further in view of Brandt (U.S. Patent No. 5,892,905, hereinafter “Brandt”) filed December 23, 1996. Claims 4, and 16-19 are dependent on claim 1. Claims 22 and 27-30 are dependent on claim 20. Therefore, claims 4, 16-19, 22 and 27-30 include the same limitations as claims 1 and 20. As noted above, Bradshaw and Shannon, taken alone or in combination do not teach or suggest the limitations recited in claim 1. These features are also missing from Brandt.

Brandt provides a common user interface for a software application accessed via the Internet. A software application runs on a web server computer system. Therefore, similarly to each of Bradshaw and Shannon, Brandt does not teach or suggest the limitations recited in claim 1.

Thus, claims 4, 16-19, 22 and 27-30 are patentable for at least the same reasons as given above with respect to claims 1 and 20.

Claims 5 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradshaw, in view of Shannon, further in View of Brandt (US Patent No. 5,892,905, hereinafter “Brandt”) filed December 23, 2996, and further in view of Dascalu (US Patent No. 5,958,015) filed October 29, 1996. Claim 5 is dependent on claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1. Claim 23 is dependent on claim 20. Therefore, claims 5 and 23 include the same limitations as claims 1 and 20. As noted above, Bradshaw and Shannon, taken alone or in combination do not teach or suggest the limitations recited in claim 1. These features are also missing from Dascalu.

Dascalu teaches a session wall that listens to communications sent over the network. It listens to communication messages exchanged between a client and a server and determines whether the messages can be permitted based on stored access rules. Therefore, similarly to each of Bradshaw and Shannon, Dascalu does not teach or suggest the limitations recited in claim 1.

Thus, claims 5 and 23 are patentable for at least the same reasons as given above with

respect to claims 1 and 20.

Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT AUTHORIZATION

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such extension.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Marina Portnova at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: April 8, 2008



Marina Portnova
Reg. No. 45,750

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300